

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are in the application. By this amendment, Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 14, 21, 22, and 24 are amended.

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As a result, Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 14, 21, 22, and 24, which were specifically cited by the Examiner, have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. As a result, each of Claims 1-30 is now in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue.

Claims 1-4, 7-13, and 19-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Bogartz (US 5,501,200). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request that each of Claims 1-4, 7-13 and 19-30 be reconsidered in view of these remarks and passed to issue over the Examiner's rejection.

As set forth initially in the various independent claims of this case, Applicants' system provides a gaseous fuel management system for an automotive vehicle in which a fuel management controller, acting upon receipt of a signal from a gas sensor sensing gaseous fuel outside of a storage tank, closes electronic valves 58a, 58b, and 58c located in a fuel line, 16, extending between storage tank 12 and the vehicle's prime mover, 26. Claim 24 has the additional limitation that the prime mover is disabled allowing operation only with a motor/generator, if fugitive fuel gas is detected while the vehicle is in operation.

The Examiner appears to be misinterpreting the Bogartz reference.

Bogartz has a gas sensor, 39, which functions only to shut down his gas compressor 7; indeed, Bogartz does not disclose any valve for cutting off the flow of high pressure gas from storage tank 5 to engine 3 if a gas leak is detected. Bogartz has a solenoid valve, 49. But valve 49 responds only to the pressure within fuel tank 5. Valve 49 is not connected to gas sensor 39.

Regarding Claim 3, Bogartz does not disclose a fuel cell in lieu of an engine.

Regarding Claim 4, Bogartz does not disclose any sort of atmospheric circulator.

Regarding Claim 8, Bogartz' motor 8 drives a gas compressor, not the vehicle's wheels. In other words, motor 8 is not a traction motor.

Finally, Bogartz is silent as to any disablement of his hydrogen-fueled engine if a leak is detected. In sum, the Examiner's rejection is manifestly unsupportable, and independent Claims 1, 21, 22, and 24, as well as each of the claims depending therefrom, are allowable over the Examiner's rejection and should be passed to issue. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5-6 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogartz. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request that each of Claims 5-6 and 14-18 be reconsidered in view of these remarks and passed to issue over the Examiner's rejection.

Regarding Claims 5 and 6, Bogartz neither teaches nor suggests anything regarding opening a window in response to a gas detection signal. And, there is certainly no suggestion of opening a moon roof in response to a gas detection signal.

Regarding Claims 14-18, Bogartz is devoid of any teaching or suggestion concerning warning the driver that gas has been detected. Similarly, there is no teaching or suggestion within the four corners of Bogartz of a sensor mounted within a fuel tank enclosure, or an engine compartment, or a passenger cabin, or an enclosure within which a traction batter is mounted.

The Examiner's rejection of Claims 5-6 and 14-18 is unsupportable, and each of these Claims should be passed to issue notwithstanding his rejection. Such action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. Further and favorable action is requested.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge any fee deficiency or refund any excess to Deposit Account No. 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,

JEROME R. DROUILLARD, PLLC

Date: 12/10/10

/Jerome R. Drouillard/
Jerome R. Drouillard, Registration No. 28,008
10213 Tims Lake Blvd.
Grass Lake, MI 49240
(517)522-6089